

PART 1:

Archetypal Gender Ontology

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 1632
Garden Grove CA 92856 USA
714-633-9508
palmer@netcom.com

Copyright 1998 K.D. Palmer.
All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.
Version 0.01; 08/16/98; ago00v00.doc

Keywords:

Summary:

Introduction:

In this essay we will explore the meaning of gender and the archetypal relations that exist between the genders in Indo-European cultures. This is necessary in order to allow us to recognize who we are as people in a world that is full of illusion concerning gender related issues. One of the thrusts of this paper is to identify one of the most ubiquitous types of cultural blindness that occurs in the World Dominant Western Culture. This cultural blindspot plays no small role in determining how we see ourselves and each other.

We take as our starting point the deepest consideration that has been made to date concerning the meaning of Gender. This is in the book *Gender Thinking*¹ by Steven G. Smith. In that book Mr. Smith proposes that we look at gender in terms of "kinds of a kind". This means that human kindness is a certain kind of thing and that each gender is a sub-kind of this

higher kind. This implies that men and women have different essences that are part of the human essence yet different from each other. We will take issue with this definition and attempt to push it deeper in order to find out the real nature of Gender within the Western Tradition.

Our point of departure is to recognize a phenomena that is pervasive but hidden in our time which as been called here "the fragmentation of Being." This phenomena is seen best in the discovery by various continental philosophers of different sorts of Being in this century. In previous studies these different sorts of Being have been identified and their relations between each other have been examined. We will repeat this analysis here as an ontological basis for the consideration of gender. We follow Heidegger in first distinguishing *Being* from *beings*. This is called Ontological Difference. If one accepts that there is a difference between individual beings and a certain property that they all share that makes them *beings* then the stage is set for the consideration of the nature of Being *qua* Being itself. This study is called ontology. Up until this century Being was pretty boring because it was unified and utterly undifferentiated conceptually. However, with the invention of phenomenology by Husserl and the aggressive exploration of human experience, as it is, as the basis for philosophizing, there were several discoveries that immediately led to the differentiation of Being. The main discovery was that in our experience essences and simple ideas are not the same. Simple ideas are abstractions while essences are the constraints governing the attributes of things. Once they were recognized to be different then the stage was set to recognize two kinds of being-in-the-world which were called Pure Being and Process Being. The realm of Pure Being is the realm of abstract glosses produced by ideation that posits illusory continuity as its basis. The realm of Process Being mixes Being with time and sees the flux of experience and the unfolding of things in which the essence changes over time. Once these two modalities of being-in-the-world were posited then the hunt was on for further types of modalities. In fact eventually two further types of modality were discovered. One is called Hyper Being and it relates to the discontinuities in the unfolding process that

¹ (Temple University, Philadelphia PA 1992)
ISBN 0-87722-964-3 LC 91-47720

Archetypal Gender Ontology -- Kent Palmer

produces different essences. Another is Wild Being that is the mixture of Continuity and Discontinuity, or Order and Disorder. My own contribution to this process of discovery was to realize that the different kinds of Being found by the various continental philosophers formed a hierarchy of meta-levels in which each one was an emergent unfolding at a higher meta-level. Also over time it became clear that there is no fourth meta-level of Being, or rather perhaps it was just very difficult to think about, so no one has come up with a description of it as yet.

Pure	Process	Hyper	Wild
Subject/ object	Dasein/ non-dasein	Query/ non-query	Enigma/ non-enigma
Present-at-hand	Ready-to- hand	In-hand	Out-of-hand
point	grasp	bear	encompass
determinate	probability	possibility	Propensity, tendency
continuity	modality	kind	integra
Being ¹	Being ²	Being ³	Being ⁴
appearance	essence	meta- essence	berzerker, line of flight

Thus Being that was a continuity previously in Western intellectual history has become fragmented into emergent meta-levels. From a plenum of Being we first conceptualized a difference in modality and then a difference in kind and finally a difference in integrity. Each integral kind of Being has a modality associated with it of being-in-the-world. These modalities have psychological concomitants like pointing, grasping, bearing and encompassing. The various integral kinds of Being define who we are in relation to each other and ourselves. At the level of Pure Being we are subject/object dualisms. But eventually we realize that we are really the ecstasy that projects the nets of duality. And eventually we begin to ask who this ecstatic projector is? When we search we find that enigmatic.

All this talk about us as human beings not in relation to our gendering each other and ourselves. This essay will consider the implications of this for gendering. If we look at ourselves as Smith wishes us to do as kinds of a kind then we will place ourselves at the level of meta-essence. Kinds of a kind are clearly meta-essences. However, instead of this definition of gender I would like to propose that gender actually occurs at each meta-level of Being

discovered by contemporary ontology and that the most significant of these is the gendering that occurs in Wild Being because our culture is blind gendering at that level in spite of the fact it exists.

In this paper we will construct a model of archetypal gendering that shows that men and women are complementary to each other by opposing each other through the different kinds of Being at each archetypal level. Our model will follow but expand on the ideas of Jung by positing at least one deeper level of archetype than the ones he talks about.

celestial female wisdom	terrestrial male wisdom
wise old man	cathonic female
anima	animus
man	woman

If we look at the man and the women in terms of archetypes we see as Jung did that the man has within him a feminine side and the woman has within her a masculine side. But reflected in each of these is again a masculine image within the anima and a feminine image within the animus. But we go on to ask about the nature of the wisdom of the Wise Old man and we find it to be celestial and feminine. If we ask about the wisdom of the cathonic female then we find it terrestrial and masculine. So the ultimate wisdom of the male is that the female can be celestial and the ultimate wisdom of the female is the male can be terrestrial. But we go on from there to assign each archetypal level a kind of Being that epitomizes it.

Appearance - Pure female celestial wisdom	Essence - Process male terrestrial wisdom
Meta-essence - Hyper wise old man	Berzerker - Wild cathonic female
Berzerker - Wild anima	Meta-essence - Hyper animus
Essence - Process man	Appearance - Pure woman

This table summarizes the major points that we wish to make with respect to archetypal gender ontology. Each level is a higher level of archetype, the archetypal levels in men and women are assigned different kinds of Being as their epitome and finally men and women are made complementary in this process.

We will spend the rest of the paper talking about the implications of this complementarity of archetypal ontological assignments in men and women. But also we want to discuss the fact that our culture is blind to the level of Wild Being so that it is normally impossible to see the important role that Wild Being plays in gendering in our culture. Thus it is important for us to realize that this was not the case with all cultures and so it is necessary for us to explore this dimension of ourselves more than we might otherwise be inclined.

The goal of this paper is to render the Archetypal Gender Ontology comprehensible as possible. We will be engaged in understanding the kinds of Being as they are exemplified in gendering, but also be trying to understand gendering in terms of the kinds of Being and the operation of the Jungian Archetypes. Further work in this direction can be seen in terms of a philosophical mentoring which would bring out other aspects of this approach to our understanding our humanity.²

Normally we confront the archetypes and the kinds of Being associated with them in terms of initiation. Thus we will also dwell on the initiatory experience for males and females in attempt to find some evidence that these associations between kinds of Being and the archetypes make sense in the context of the Indo-European tradition of which we are a part and which has become world dominant. Indo-European initiation was a theme in the book by the author called The Fragmentation of Being and the Path beyond the Void. There also the meaning of marriage was delved into and the progressive reifications in the relations between men and women were explored. Here we expand upon those studies and make the relation between archetypal levels in males and females and the kindness of Being more explicit.

Learning and Change

Our world is more and more based on the earth dominant Western Colonialist culture which springs from Indo-European origins. This worldview brings with it fundamental

² See Philosophical Mentoring: A Research Proposal at <http://dialog.net:85/homepage/philcounsel.htm>

ontological assumptions that color everything we comprehend about the world. Most fundamental of these are our notions about what is and what is not. Being is the most fundamental concept in the Indo-European worldview. In the author's dissertation The Structure of Theoretical Systems in Relation to Emergence³ the fragmentation of Being as a phenomena was first recognized and the meta-levels of Being identified based on the work of Continental ontologists. This work was extended in a subsequent book called The Fragmentation of Being and the Path Beyond the Void⁴ in which it was discovered that this fragmentation of the concept of Being had its origins in the mists of Indo-European history and that we are just rediscovering it in modern ontology. In fact, in that book it was shown that the phenomena of emergence, radical newness within the Indo-European worldview, is made possible by the fragmentation of Being. This gives new deeper meaning to the well known phrase "the more things change the more they stay the same." What stays the same are the meta-levels of Being and this sameness allows for radical transformations within the Indo-European worldview. This patterning was set up in the prehistory of the Indo-European worldview when the language of Being unique to the Indo-Europeans was forged. Each verb "to-be" in Indo-European languages are composed out of other roots, so that we can see the results of a cultural project of constructing Being laid down as traces in the languages. When we talk about everything in our world even each other as different genders it is tainted by this linguistic socially constructed projection of Being.

Each kind of Being is harder to think about than the last lower on the hierarchy. We can get a feel for this by using Bateson's hierarchy of Learning⁵. In fact we can take his physical hierarchy and contrast it to that. He uses motion as an example to show that there are only four physical meta-levels of motion but we can substitute change for motion in order to get definitions that take us across the split between physus (change) and logos (learning). In

³ <http://dialog.net:85/homepage/disab.html>

⁴ <http://dialog.net:85/homepage/fbpathc.htm>

⁵ See Steps to the Ecology of the Mind

Archetypal Gender Ontology -- Kent Palmer

Advanced Process Architecture⁶ tutorial I produce a model of work process that that combines change and learning to define work.

<u>Logos</u>	<u>Ontos</u>	<u>Phusos</u>
	<u>Neuter</u>	
Learning ¹ <i>learning</i>	Being ¹ PURE	Change ¹ <i>change</i>
Learning ² <i>learning to learn</i>	Being ² PROCESS	Change ² <i>changing change</i>
Learning ³ <i>learning to learn to learn</i>	Being ³ HYPER	Change ³ <i>changing changed changes</i>
Learning ⁴ <i>learning to learn to learn to learn</i>	Being ⁴ WILD	Change ⁴ <i>change of changing changed changes</i>

If you try to think the meta-levels of learning or the meta-levels of change you will find that they get harder and harder to think until one reaches that fifth meta-level that seems unthinkable. Each level of learning or change indicates a level of Being which is the synthetic unity of Phusos and Logos at that meta-level. If we define work as beginning with what Sartre calls the practico-inert and applying differentially change and learning to it then the meta-levels of change and learning together define work processes. The point here is that as we go up the meta-levels we are assuming that it is irrelevant what gender one happens to be. But our archetypal model tells us otherwise. In fact there are fundamental differences between men and women as they go up the meta-levels with respect to their prosecution of their lives. Thus the hypothesis here is that men and women although they share the kinds of Being actually are complementary in their implementation of them concretely and practically in their lives. Thus learning and change at the various meta-

levels takes on a different character for the man and the woman.

<u>Logos</u>	<u>Ontos</u>	<u>Ontos</u>	<u>Phusos</u>
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	
Learning ¹ <i>Learning</i>	Being ² PROCESS	Being ¹ PURE	Change ¹ <i>change</i>
Learning ² <i>learning to learn</i>	Being ⁴ WILD	Being ³ HYPER	Change ² <i>changing change</i>
Learning ³ <i>learning to learn to learn</i>	Being ³ HYPER	Being ⁴ WILD	Change ³ <i>changing changed changes</i>
Learning ⁴ <i>learning to learn to learn to learn</i>	Being ¹ APPEARANCE	Being ² ESSENCE	Change ⁴ <i>change of changing changed changes</i>

The scrambling of the ontos with respect to the phusos and logos has profound implications for us as human beings trapped in the Indo-European worldview. It colors our view of each other in fundamental ways. In other words, we appear outwardly to have the same understanding of phusos and logos meta-levels but in terms of our inward archetypal understanding the kinds of Being are scrambled in relation to the meta-levels of learning and change so as to make men and women complementary within our worldview. This scrambling effect is what accounts for the continual misunderstanding between men and women. If we did not share the kinds of Being with each other we could not be in the same Indo-European worldview but if we did not apply them differently then we would be the same. So in order to erect the gender differences there are profound cultural routines that are socially constructed that produce the difference between men and women by applying the various meta-levels of being differently at the various meta-levels of learning and change.

A great deal of human suffering has been

⁶ See <http://dialog.net:85/homepage/advanced.htm>

occasioned by the mutual mis-understandings that this ontological repatterning that produces gender has occasioned. Thus we cannot talk about it without incurring some pain. But we will hope that knowledge of what is happening on this fundamental level will in some way entail a healing process that needs to occur as we recognize how our culture transmits a gender based fundamental ontology to each of us to produce complementarity across the all important gender demarcation line. Without each gender knowing all four levels of Being we could not live in the same worldview, but without variety in assignment of roles with respect to those meta-levels of Being then we would not perceive gender differences in the world and thus the world would not be nearly as interesting to us. However, the same thing that generates our interest in the complementary other is what creates all the misunderstanding between the sexes.

We must remark that ontological gender differences are inward expressions of ontological assignment and are thus archetypal rather than outward. Outwardly the Neuter ontological assignment prevails. But inwardly the ontological gender assignments vary depending on sex. Thus there is a powerful commonality outwardly. But inwardly there is a fundamental difference that corresponds to the outward physical difference between the sexes that is used as a marker for gender enculturation that produces the inward archetypal differentiations.

But one of the most significant aspects of this relation between gendering and culture is the fact that we are culturally blind to the level of Wild Being in our culture. In other words Smith when he thinks about gender he considers that at its deepest gender is a difference of a meta-kind, the kindness of a kind. He does not consider anything beyond that. However, here we will go beyond Meta-essences to consider the nature of Gender at the level of Wild Being. That is gender behind closed doors, i.e. beyond the veil of public scrutiny in the taboo area beyond meta-essences.

First we must distinguish between essence and appearance. Appearances are what shows on the surface which has many attributes. Essences constrain these attributes. Thus we can think of the essences of men and the essences of women

as those limits on their characteristics beyond which they would not longer be recognized as male or female. Sometimes there is strict definition of these characteristics limited to dress, and outward appearance or biological differentiation. Meta-essence refers to the constraints on the constraints. This is to say that meta-essence relates to the transformations that are allowed in essences. We see these in the genetic unfolding of the developmental processes in organisms. We see this in transvestite behavior socially. We see this radically in trans-sexual transformations that are done with hormones or surgery. In other words, the kindness of kinds refers to the possibility of one kind transforming into another kind. So if we concentrate on the meta-essence then we are led to consider the intertransformation between sexes as something akin to the developmental transformations as an organism genetically unfolds. Saying this takes into account that we are both of the same species and attempts to show that we are different and intertransformable at some meta-level above the species. Yet we do not normally think of gender in terms of intra-gender transformation. Rather we tend to think of it as fixed and that such sex-changes are abnormal. So it seems we must push beyond the level of the possibility of sexual change to something else. But it is unclear in our culture what else there might be as a basis for understanding gender.

Here we suggest that beyond Hyper Being where meta-essences occur there is yet another higher meta-level called Wild Being. Wild Being is normally not thought of because it is hidden from us culturally. But it is at the level of Wild Being that we think the locus of gendering exists. The level of Meta-essences is what Derrida calls differAnce. He talks about it as a hinge of differing and deferring. It occurs when ever we cannot place someone in a particular gender category and we are unsure if it is a man or a woman. This indecisiveness is the root of our thought that male can become female or female can become male if only, they changed their clothes, or their sex organs, or their style of behavior or what ever. This is what Derrida calls the level of Traces which he deals with in Of Grammatology. The traces are the imprints that are left by the markers of gender, either cultural or physical. But beyond these are the propensities to be male or female that exist

within us whether we follow them or not. The constraints of essence or the meta-constraints of traces exist as an envelope around propensities. Propensities are tendencies to become this or that. For each of us there are tendencies to become designated by ourselves or others as male or female prior to any rational choice. These tendencies arise out of the social field itself. They occur due to habituated social behavior which is very conservative in its response to our human finitude. This habituated response prior to active social construction of our gendering is the basis for the unfolding of gender constraints and meta-constraints. Prior to any thought of changing genders there is the habituated social response toward our finitude that recognizes us as gendered and makes us recognize ourselves as gendered based on that response of others. All of this occurs behind closed doors in our society, i.e. out of the public sphere in the private sphere. It is in the doctors office we first see the ultra-sound images that make the nurse exclaim that it is a male or female child. Or it is in the Hospital or birthing room that the caregivers for the woman bearing a child exclaim the sex of the child upon recognizing the signs from our finitude in us as we appear from the womb. From them on sex becomes something covered, veiled and private despite our external signs that mark our sexual orientation and gendered self image. We get some highly charged glimpses into that world of the other sex as we grow up and finally we enter into intimate sexual relations with the other, how ever it is defined. These intimate relations were traditionally hidden behind the door of the bedroom of the married couple. Since then all kinds of other relations have become a norm. But the privacy surrounding what consenting adults do together has not changed. What has changed radically is the pornographic exposure of this intimate realm.

Now when we move to the level of Wild Being our culture lacks the vocabulary to deal with it. Deleuze and Guattari have developed a specialized vocabulary that describes it. The call it rhizomatic, i.e. it is like a network that has no beginning or end but that is complex and interconnected. They talk about it in terms of desiring machines and the socius. Human individuals are made up of many desiring machines that appear out of their unconsciousnesses (called the body-without-

organs). These desiring machines appear in the social field called the socius. Individuals are collections of desiring machines. To these we might add the idea of disseminating machines⁷ that the sources for the fluxes that the desiring machine desires. Human individuals as persons are socially constructed out of the social field from desiring or disseminating machine parts. They form a rhizomic network that continually transforms across the bodies of the individuals that make up the society.

But another way of understanding this rhizome and its continually rebuilding of itself a part of which is its self-construction of its own gendering, is in terms of Chinese traditional science that discriminates Chi and Li. In other words the fluxes of energies, both subtle and gross can be seen in terms of the flowing of Chi throughout the social body. Li are the patternings that are left behind by this flow. Li originally mean the patterning in jade. One way of thinking about all this is to consider gold, diamonds and Jade. Jade was more precious than gold or diamonds to the Chinese. Gold represents the essence that is fixed and does not interact or change at all. Diamonds are created from coal under tremendous pressure. When that pressure is exerted the coal changes its essence and becomes diamonds. This is an excellent way of picturing the meta-essence. But beyond gold essence and diamond meta-essence is jade. Jade is a particular kind of crystallization process that renders unusual crystals that are long and very resilient. Thus jade can be shaped intricately, and will hold its shape despite intricate carving. Gold is poured into a mold to shape it. Diamonds receive their patterning inwardly from the nomos of the tetrahedral carbon bonds. Diamonds are cut taking advantage of that inward ordering. Jade is carved. Jade has subtle patterning and coloration which is unique to each piece while diamonds are uniform. Thus the Wild Being appears as the unique patterning of the individual beyond the essence or meta-essence. In that unique patterning we see the flows of energies that produce the patterning as if held in stasis as when we look at the rings of a tree. Part of this unique patterning of the individual is his/her gendering. It is that which we apprehend

⁷ I owe this idea to Aiyub Palmer

in our mutual privacy. It is that which our culture with its obsession with control and domination has traditionally ignored. Our human finitude does not just relate to our general character as human beings but to our specific characteristics as *this* human. This is why Oedipus' self-reference when answering the Sphinx is so important because it refers to both levels of explanation at the same time. Culturally we tend to ignore everything that is not expressed in terms of essence. We suppress the appearances saying that they are transitory and change continually and cannot be believed. We suppress meta-essence because it makes us think the world is unstable. But most of all we suppress the propensities and tendencies of Wild Being because they are so uncontrollable. Kevin Kelly alludes to this level when describing the new paradigm he sees emerging in his book Out of Control. These propensities and tendencies make us concentrate on what is unique about us. Part of that uniqueness is how we construct and project gender before we even think of ourselves as different from others due to our absorption in the social milieu.

We want to argue that the level of Wild Being is the origin of gendering not the level of Hyper Being. But that each level of Being contributes to our gendering to some degree. Thus we have certain propensities to take on a certain gender valuation before we even think about ourselves as having gender and its differences from the gender of others, because from the first before we think anything others are projecting gender on us and treating us differently based on their presuppositions about gender. But then these propensities are contained first of all in meta-essences that constrain our transformative possibilities, and then in essences that fix our characteristics in the moment, and then in appearances which are our reflections on the surface of the world. At each level Gendering unfolds but unless we comprehend the level of Wild Being it will be impossible to understand all others. That is because essences and meta-essences are constraints. We have to have something to constrain and that is given at the level of our finitude as a rhizome of disseminating and desiring machines embedded in a socius. There are myriad flows of energies though this field and they lay down patternings that build up over time. Prior to any thought of what gender we are and of changing to another

gender we are already in this patterning as designated as one gender or another by others and by ourselves. This is a level beyond the traces that imprint upon us. It is what Merleau-Ponty called Flesh.

Each of us needs to discover this territory which is behind closed doors in our society within which we express our sexuality with designated others exploring our unique finitude with the unique finitude of others. When ever we encounter our finitude we go into trance. There are trances associated with reading, conversation, eating, clothing, sleep, and sexuality. This blend of trances are well entered into when we begin to explore the realm of Wild Being and its Flesh. Flesh is clothed, Flesh is fed, Flesh sleeps, Flesh reads and talks, Flesh engages in sexual practices. And in all those states the Flesh is entranced and entrancing. Discursive talk occurs in the designated as real world outside of the trances so it cannot relate what is found there by each of us. Thus we only have access to that by our personal experiences and though a tacit knowing.

However, in our tradition the process of initiation has always been a guideline for helping us though the stages of this kind of knowing. So we will begin to explore the concepts of initiation that occur in the myths of our culture as a means of seeing our way into the archetypal depths of our experience.

Vasalisa

We start off with the story of Vasalisa that is quoted in Clarissa Pinkola Estes book Women Who Run With the Wolves. In that story the series of stages of initiation that she outlines relates to the kinds of Being as embodied by women. The first two steps are related to Pure Being in which Vasalisa's good mother dies and is replaced by the bad stepmother and children. This oscillation between too good and too bad is an image of nihilism. It appears as an image of Pure Being which produces nihilism. In our lives we are trapped between the horns of nihilistic dilemmas all the time. Being produces these nihilistic alternatives that trap us. So the first two stages of the initiatory journey describe this point of departure where the pure plenum of nihilism is defined. In that pure plenum myriad

nihilistic alternatives are created that entrap us. Vasalisa is eventually thrown out of this purely present world by her step mother and step sisters who want to get rid of her. They send her out into the forest in the dark to look for fire. She has been given a doll by her mother that guides her. This doll represents the meta-essence. It is what understands the transformation that she needs to make in her self that she does not understand. The fact that it is a doll that is dressed exactly like her is very interesting.

Women are split in Western culture between meta-essence and appearances. We see this in the myth of the Good Helen and the Bad Helen. They are nihilistic opposite images of woman. We see it in the story of Nephele and Hera. Nephele was an image of Hera produced by Zeus to entrap a seducer. But when the seducer was punished then there was an extra copy of Hera floating around that she had to get rid of. From that comes the primal scene that is the basis of the epic of Jason and the Argonauts. This split can be understood when you know that women are seen as mere appearances in the eyes of men but who come to know change more fundamentally than men. Women in patriarchy change names, homes, and undergo childbirth and the death of their significant others in a way that men do not. Women wash the bodies of the dead. They control the transformative operations of childbirth, and of making food, making clothes, giving sexual pleasure, and other activities that deal directly with our human finitude. Thus women have two natures, as appearances and as those who understand transformation. What they conspicuously lack is an essence. It is the men who have an essence but women are expected to adapt to the man and thus are more flexible when they do not cultivate an essence themselves. So the doll that helps Vasalisa is a representation of her meta-essence in spite of the fact that it is a small representation of herself, i.e. merely an appearance of something alive. Also the doll is a form of self-reference though similar appearances. On the journey which is directed by the doll Vasalisa sees three horsemen who she does not understand and eventually ends up at the house of the old witch Baba Yaga, the wild woman. We can think of the journey as a leaving of the clearing in Being where all the appearances of the nihilistic opposites appear.

We can think of it as an essential transformation from light to dark caused by the meta-essence of Vasalisa. It is a journey through Hyper Being. But when Vasalisa reaches the house of the Witch then she encounters Wild Being. That is in the form of the archetype of the cathonic female. The Wild Woman puts Vasalisa to work in her home doing impossible tasks that the meta-essence doll accomplishes for her. This serving the old wild woman is her taste of Process Being. She does the house hold chores and when she can do no more the work is done for her by her transformative part. In this way Vasalisa encounters all the stages of Being and goes beyond Being to encounter existence. In that encounter she is given the task of sorting things out which are all impossible, but she does it. This symbolizes making non-nihilistic distinctions, i.e. subtle distinctions. After that she can ask about the mysteries of who the horsemen are. The witch says that they represent day, morning, and night. Notice that morning stands between day and night. In other words it is a non-dual between the duals. The rising of the sun is prior to both day and night because the original appearance of the sun makes day and night possible as dualistic opposite. The horsemen represent time passing. We can compare this to the riddle of the sphinx and see that the man is given a question concerning time in the stages of life while the woman is given a question about time in the oscillation between the natural opposites of day and night and the realization of their non-duality in dawn. Vasalisa knows when to stop asking questions. But is eventually shown out and given a burning scull that when she gets home burns up the step mother and step sisters. Beyond Being she sees the non-nihilistic in her sorting task. She sees the non-dual in the appearance of dawn between day and night. And she sees the supra-rational in her knowing when to stop asking questions.

This story is amazing in as much as it encapsulates the stages of the initiation in such a way that the four kinds of Being are passed though in the correct order for women and then it goes beyond Being to show us the non-dual non-nihilistic and supra-rational. Thus we take it as evidence that our staging of the levels of Being in terms of the sequence of initiation for women is correct.

Ariadne

But what we would like just to make sure that this sequence is well rooted in myth is a case from Greek mythology. We see that in the story of Ariadne. She lived in Crete and her father was Minos. When Theseus came to kill the Minotaur she betrayed her father and city and helped him. So in her girlhood she appeared to be a loyal daughter, as was Medea, in her city too. The Greeks talked about the transformation of women in terms of their distrust of their loyalty to the city of their childhood. These appearances of Pure Being are broken when Theseus arrives. He is given the ball of string to lead him to the Minotaur. In some stories the ball of string guides him into the Labyrinth, which is like the forest in the Vasalisa story. He comes face to face there with a monster, something that should normally be hidden is revealed and killed. The Ariadne runs off with Theseus. Theseus explores for Ariadne the deep secret of her family. The Minotaur is a brother of hers. Theseus brings out what is hidden and exposes it to the cruel light of day. Hyper Being has as one of its characteristics what is called by Henry The Essence of Manifestation. That is like the unconscious of not of awareness but of manifestation itself. It is pure immanence that is never made transcendent. Theseus abandons Ariadne because he always treats those whom he deals with in the same way they treat others. She betrayed her city so he betrayed her likewise.

On Naxos Ariadne meets Dionysus. Dionysus is the embodiment of Wild Being. She marries him and bears him children. This marriage and bearing of Children is equal to Process Being. The appearance of Dionysus when he first arrives with his wild band is the manifestation of Wild Being. In the end Homer says that Artemis kills Ariadne as the instigation of Dionysus. Thus she has an epiphany of the goddess at the end of her life. That goddess is eternally virgin living in the forest and hunting like a man. Thus Artemis represents the male terrestrial knowledge of the Cathonic Female. Similarly the questions that Vasalisa asks are about there male horsemen. In her answer she finds out about time. There are many variations of the Ariadne story and so it is quite undecidable at the point after the Minotaur is killed, i.e. at the point of the advent of Hyper

Being. This is to be expected as the myth embodies what it talks about.

So with the Ariadne myth we establish the sequence for female initiation as Pure, Hyper, Wild and then Process. What we would like to do now is attempt to establish the male initiation sequence as different but complementary to this. We will do that by considering Achilles.

Achilles

Now that we have examples of feminine initiation which pass through the kinds of Being the particular order that we have specified it behooves us to look for male examples that take the other order. When looking at male initiation we can do no better than to look at Achilles as he appears in the Iliad and Quintus. Quintus tells the rest of the story of the Trojan war that Homer does not get around to telling us. When we look at Achilles situation we can see he is caught in a nihilistic double bind when Agamemnon steals Breisus from him. When Agamemnon does the same thing as Paris has done to Menalaus then Achilles goes through a crisis of meaning in relation to the war they are fighting and withdraws. Thus War is the process and the retreat from war is the nihilistic opposite of it. This is similar to the Too Good and Too Bad mothers of Vasalisa. But the difference is that for Vasalisa the mother is a static external condition whereas for Achilles war is a pursuit of Glory that must be prosecuted with vigor. Thus Vasalisa is caught in the realm of appearances which she must break out of or be forced out of while Achilles has a fixed essence as a heroic warrior that he must uphold by the work of fighting. The opposite of this pursuit is leisure that he acquires when he withdraws, but it is leisure with the knowledge that his absence is hurting the Acheean effort and many are dying due to him. But he does not care and calls down the curse of the Gods on the Acheeans without realizing that it will mean the death of Petroclus.

Everything changes when Petroclus is killed. He has gone out in Achilles armor as his persona and was destroyed. Achilles becomes enraged and enters into Wild Being from Process Being. He goes Berzerk which is an archetypal pattern among the Indo-Europeans. He Kills Hector in

this rage. Then when he meets Paris he becomes humanized again. Thus he transfers from the sensory father to the father of meaning. Paris and Achilles are Father who loses son and son who is lost to Father. In each other they recognize the human condition and weep together. Thus the rage is abated by the mutual recognition of death and their loss in the other. Achilles does not reach Hyper Being until the scene where he kills the Amazon Queen. At the moment he kills her he falls in love for her. A love greater than he had for Petroclus. This ambivalent situation of lover/killer is the advent of Hyper Being. After that there is the struggle between Achilles and Memnon the Ethiopian both sons of Zeus. Dark doom enters into the heart of Memnon and Bright Doom enters into the heart of Achilles. Thus they embody the too dark and too light. The one who is too dark in his glory, the black one has as a mother dawn. The one who is too light in his glory has as a mother Theitis who lives at the bottom of the sea hidden. Zeus says before the battle that the gods are not to interfere in their struggle. They are held equal for a long time but then suddenly the balance tips in favor of Achilles. So the moment of indecision breaks in favor of the Achaeans. In the very next scene Achilles in his hubris faces Apollo who kills him from a dark mist with an arrow to his ankle. This is the manifestation of Pure Being similar to the manifestation of Artemis to Ariadne. Pure Being is entered by the one who transgresses against the gods and thus is confronted by the presence of the gods themselves who right the balance and prevent the berzerker from overcoming all limits.

Achilles experiences the levels of Being in the order suggested by the archetypal gender ontology. It is an amazing thing that this ordering of the kinds of Being has always been there within the story unrecognized because we did not have a proper ontological theory as to the significance of the events in the story. Now we can see that the Iliad and Quintus map out the initiation rights of manhood in the event that befall Achilles the hero. This is the archetypal unfolding that all Hero's much encounter as they mature into manhood.

Perseus

In The Fragmentation of Being and the Path

Beyond the Void we studied the myth of Perseus and compared that with the metaphors for women uncovered by Page Dubios. In that we saw the reification of the relations between men and women from the viewpoint of the unfolding of the kinds of Being. The five magical implements of Perseus (sword, shield, purse, helmet and sandals) represent the five functions of Indo-European society. Similarly these are related to the five metaphors for women. Andromeda is the woman as appearance whose mother claims is more beautiful than a goddess. The three old women, the Graeae, that tell Perseus how to find the Medusa are the representations of the meta-essence. They tell Perseus which way to go. The Medusa is the representation of the Wild Woman from the viewpoint of the male society to whom she is a monster. So we see Perseus the destroyer as wandering through the archetypal landscape of women. He does so in the correct order. Danae his mother is thrown first into a dungeon and then into an ark cast out to sea. When he grows up he is asked to contribute a marriage gift for their protector who wants to marry his mother. He says that he will procure the gift of the Medusa's head. Danae is in the position of the woman who is purely present as she made love to Zeus in a shower of gold while she was imprisoned. Perseus was the result of this manifestation of Pure Being. From there Perseus left to visit the Graeae, in Hyper Being, who lead him along the way. They possess one eye and one tooth between them which they pass around. This reminds us of the relation between the Cyclopes and the hundred handed ones. Once he finds out where to go he is given magical tools by Hermes and Athena. Then he enters Wild Being where he finds and kills the Medusa who represents the wild woman. Finally Perseus uses the Medusa's head to petrify the Female monster and save Andromeda. After that he returns home and presents the head to the suitor of his mother and turns him and his companions to stone. The female monster represents Process Being due to its arising from the sea. Thus Perseus destroys all the feminine archetypes one after another.

The male archetypes are hidden in the five implements that Perseus is given. Perseus collected these things, except for the mirror shield he received from Athena, from the Stygian Nymphs whose whereabouts he finds

from the Graeae. First he got the Shield from Athena, the Adamantine Sickle from Hermes, and finally the other paraphernalia from the Stygian Nymphs.

Reflective Athena	Shield	Mitra
Sickle	Hermes	Indra
Invisible Stygian	Helmet	Varuna
Wallet	Stygian	Female Goddess
Flying Stygian	Sandals	Twins

Varuna -- King -- Invisible Helmet
-- Pure Being (2)
Mitra -- Priest -- Reflective Shield
Process Being (3)
Indra -- Warrior -- Adamantine Sickle
Hyper Being (1)
Female Goddess Impenetrable Wallet & Twins Flying Sandals -- Fecundity --
Wild Being (4)
Otherness beyond the city --

Now notice that Athena gives him the reflective shield first. Then Hermes gives him the Sickle. The rest he gets from the Stygian Nymphs. Process Being lies between these two stages. This is his starting point. The process is that of destruction of the archetypal meta-levels. He begins his journey by going out into the wilds and meeting the Graeae and the Stygian Nymphs. Thus he enters into Wild Being beyond the city. When he kills the Medusa with this

gear he frees Pegasus and Chrysaor from her body. This transformation signifies his entry into Hyper Being. Finally when he presents the head of the Gorgon and freezes people and monsters he gives rise to Frozen Pure Being. So within the same myth the archetypes of the feminine and masculine initiation ceremonies are hidden each in their proper order.

Theseus

Theseus is similar in that he begins by moving a rock and discovering sandals and a sword left there by his father. His process was the discovery of his birth right. The moving of the rock is his Process. After than he travels through wild country paying back bandits as they treated others. Thus he turns Wild Being back on itself. After that he enters Athens and agrees to go with the sacrifices to the Minotar to Crete. The episode of the Minotar is the representation of Hyper Being as we have said before concerning Ariadne. After that Theseus becomes King of Athens and eventually repulses the Amazons. Pure Being in this case is represented by his unrivaled Kingship in Athens. If we look however at the women in his life we see that first there is Madea, then Ariadne then the Amazon and finally Phaedra. Madea is the embodiment of Hyper Being which leads him to confront the Minotaur. Ariadne is the representative of Pure Being. The amazon is the representative of Wild Being. Phaedra his lawful wife represents Process Being. The order of the encounter of these women does not bear the pattern we are exploring but each of them clearly represents these aspects of feminine being.

Oedipus and Odysseus

We have considered the Hero's Achilles, Theseus, and Perseus. Initiation forces them to explore the archetypal underpinnings of their selves. And as we have seen these archetypal underpinnings conform to our theory of the male or female inward sequences of the Kindness of Being which are both variations on the shared outward sequences. By scrambling the sequence of the kinds of Being the male and the female produce and inward complementarity. They share the outward structure of the Indo-European worldview but inwardly they

experience it differently because their archetypal levels are rooted in different kinds of Being as we move through the initiation sequence.

Now we will consider the anomalies of the pharmacon who is the opposite of the heroes. We rely on Goux who tells us that Oedipus is the archetype of the philosopher and that he is the one who fails the initiation ceremony of the Hero. Oedipus as a myth embodies the wisdom of what occurs when the Initiation fails. This is when the hero fails to find the father of meaning to replace the sensory father. When this failure occurs the son turns back on the parents and commits the fundamental crimes against the father, mother and bride. These are mirrored in the crimes of the Achaeans who sacked Troy and for which Odysseus paid so dearly as the scapegoat. In the case of Odysseus the crimes were the trickery of the Horse. The raping of the women in the temple of Athena and the carrying off or destroying the image of the goddess. The Achaeans realized their mistake and argued over whether to stay in do sacrifices or to flee. Agamemnon stayed and Menelaus ran. The one who left first was the last home. The one who stayed to sacrifice was killed by his wife on his return. The one who flew away in fear made it home with his wife but had to live forever with his wife's betrayal. Agamemnon and Menelaus were nihilistic opposites and Odysseus is trapped oscillating between them. Odysseus is lost in the oblivion of the vast sea. It is only when Athena's anger abates that he is released from the island of Calypso after nine years. The Odyssey starts at the point when Athena's attitude toward Odysseus the pharmacon changes. His journey back is like the finding of a place to die by the wandering blinded Oedipus. Both commit crimes against all the sacred registers of their societies and are scapegoats who are eventually redeemed.

Now when we look at Oedipus we see that he confronts the Sphinx on his entry into Thebes and with the blind Tereseus on this exit from Thebes. On his entry he points to himself as the answer to the question of the Sphinx. On his exit he judges himself and punishes himself once he has grasped himself and his dreadful fate. So on entry he is confronted by his anima and on exit he is confronted by the wise old man of the blind sage. He becomes blind himself and through that acquires after much suffering

inner sight. So here in the Myth of Oedipus the archetypal levels are clearly marked in terms of the entry into the city and the exit from the city.

The city itself is in a quandary. It has lost its king. It has been attacked by a Monster. It has a plague. Oedipus is the origin or all its ills and its savior. Oedipus is the one responsible for its loss of its king. He becomes its king. He is both usurper and rightful heir at the same time. The sphinx appears before the city as a warning, as if it were his own conscience asking him to look at his life before he commits further crimes. But he gives a quick answer that is at once a reference to his essence as man and also is a reference to himself as an individual existent. So he enters to become king and husband of his own mother. After that his children become his own siblings and his paradoxicality becomes complete.

What we want to do is see how the kindness of Being enters into the failed initiation of Oedipus. Prior to the meeting with the sphinx he meets his father. At that point his father is unkind to a stranger and the stranger takes revenge. He kills the arrogant man at the place where the road forks three ways. Later he discovers that that man was his real father. Oedipus is in the process of running away from his fate when he meets and kills his unknown father and thus fulfills his fate in the very process of trying to avoid it. This is Oedipus' work the process of fulfilling his fate. His essence has been predetermined by the fates and dictated to the father and to himself by the oracles.

When he encounters the Sphinx, who is his anima and an image of himself as quandary he does not go wild as one might expect. Rather he becomes a thinker rather than an actor like Achilles, Perseus or Theseus. As a thinker he answers the riddle and thus the monster dies. The interpretation of Goux that the sphinx is the bride of the hero seems to not be very deep. I think we must interpret the sphinx as an internal image of himself rather than the bride not to be. Oedipus is also considered to be a thinker, i.e. a man of metis, cunning. Oedipus is cunning to use self-reference to answer the riddle. An answer of self-reference is always right because it merely refers to itself, and that self-reference can always be verified. So Oedipus does not go wild at the level of the anima's appearance. He

does the opposite and instead thinks and produces an answer that is the thought of himself. When he reaches the realization of who he is in the city then he fails to recognize the father of meaning, Tereseus who is continually warning him. Rather he becomes the father of meaning outwardly by blinding himself. So rather than becoming the initiator inwardly he becomes like him outwardly. Self-blinding is the opposite of insight into meanings. So at the point when he should enter into Hyper Being and become the initiator he instead exits the city as the pharmacon. Finally, beyond the city he should if he were the hero realize the wisdom of the wise old man which is female and celestial. But instead he wanders in suffering until he finds a place to rest on forbidden sacred land. What is sacred does not appear to him and he transgresses the invisible boundaries without knowing. When he is confronted by that transgression he says he will stay there to die. Finally Theseus shows up and Oedipus tells him a secret for him to pass on to his children. We do not know what that secret is. But we assume it is how to avoid becoming a pharmacon and how to instead become a hero with a fulfilled initiation. At the end of his life, unlike Ariadne or Achilles, there is not epiphany of a god or goddess. Rather Oedipus himself becomes the epiphany to the sons of the hero. He revels in his self destruction and the fulfilling of his personal fate as the most hated and miserable of human beings who has broken all the taboos. The one who breaks the taboos and suffers the consequences is the one who understands their ultimate meaning. We assume that it is this that Oedipus has to tell the sons of Theseus. In that the meaning of the pharmacon and the meaning of the hero cancel each other out. In that is revealed the void.

Odysseus is an example of an initiated hero, he was initiated by his grandfather Wolfman and bears the mark of the boar wound, who falls from grace through his violation of the taboos of his culture. For that he is cast into oblivion. The process he is engaged in like Oedipus is his return home and his self discovery. The oblivion of the sea is the background for that project of self discovery. Instead of his becoming wild he is submerged in the wildness of the seas and of the god Poseidon that rules that realm. The Hyper-Being that he encounters is the enigmatic nature of the gods and goddesses and their

toying with him. They live hidden within manifestation and attack and guide him by turns. Thus Hyper Being is seen in the ambivalence of the Gods toward him. First Athena is angry and then shows pity. Then Poseidon is angry but at last directs his anger at others instead. Pure Being is when one of the gods appears to him. The manifestation of Athena to Oedipus and others is the appearance of immortality to mortals, of the transcendent to the immanent. Thus in a more general way do we see how the kinds of Being interplay within the ordeal of Odysseus.

Interplay of the Kindnesses of Being

So we have now explored the mythological background of initiation and seen that the kindness of Being is complementarily distributed between the levels of the male and female archetypes. This produces an interplay between the male and female initiations that become expressed in mythology and cause us to be endlessly fascinated with each other in our lives. At this point I would like to explore this interplay.

On the surface of our lives men are essences and women are appearances. But women when we look deeper can comprehend transformation as meta-essences while men cannot. Men on the other hand enter into Wildness at the level of the anima and comprehend chaos. This is why the man feels lost in the woman while the woman is transformed by the man. Like Peleus the man must hold on to the woman as she transforms as did Thetis. Like the lovers of Aphrodite men become completely obsessed with women. So there is an interplay between what the woman is within her self and what the man is to her. Similarly there is an interplay between what the man is within himself as anima and what the woman is to him. This mutual interplay has deep consequences for our life experience in terms of gendering.

The initiations of the women and the men are separate. But there needs to be a mutual initiation as well to complete the separate initiations of women by women and men by men. We can call that mutual initiation Tantra. In the separate initiations we recognize the field of men or the field of women and our unique

place within it. We learn to avoid the taboos and thus not just how to live in society but also how to avoid being rejected by it and its gods. But also we need to consider the mutual initiation that takes place in the interplay between men and women. In that the men initiate the women and the women initiate the men. This is what occurs as the sexes interact within life.

Men are essences in the midst of process. Women are appearances in the midst of frozen surfaces. Men give to women their essences in return for the appearances. Women give to men their appearances in return for the essences. Then at the next level men go wild with rage while women transform. Women give men their knowledge of transformation in return for the wildness of men. Men give women their knowledge of wildness in return for the understanding of transformation. At the next level men understand transformation while the woman understand wildness. Notice that they have exchanged roles from the lower level. Knowledge of Wildness in men becomes understanding of Transformation for them. Knowledge of Transformation in women becomes understanding of Wildness for them. Finally at the highest level the men understand appearances and the women understand process. This is the deepest root and at that level the surfaces of the two genders are interchanged. This completes the complementarity of the genders and for each produces a face of the word where all the kinds of being synergize. Men and Women are each faces of the world to each other. Each is a synergy of the kindness of Being to each other. These synergies are complementary so that they fit together and form a union which is always fascinating to each other. The genders are the Same in the sense of belonging together. Together they tell each other about their own depths and are the faces of the world to each other.

Emptiness of Existence

Now that we can comprehend how men and women belong together as complementary faces of the world it is possible to go beyond that to explore the existence of gender beyond Being. As we mount the steps of the meta-levels of the kindness of Being we discover at the fifth meta-level that there is no more steps. We reach a

dead end that is unthinkable and unexperienceable. That dead end is called existence that is beyond Being. We comprehend that existence as empty in the Buddhist sense of Sunyata. At the fifth meta-level we discover that gender is empty and ultimately unthinkable and unexperienceable. It is a koan in the sense of Zen Buddhism as a supra-rational state of affairs. This is the meaning of tantra in Buddhism. It goes beyond the complementarity of forms to comprehend the emptiness of the faces of the world. At that point gender is no longer a presentation from self to society or from society to self. But when we discover that the self is empty, all the selves are empty then we realize that gender is something that is merely found in existence beyond its valuation and its cultivation. Each gender discovers that the self and other interpenetrate as interdependent mutual arisings. God created everything in pairs. And the wisdom in that is that only God is unique and without a pair. Ultimately our self and other understanding is knowledge of God. Inwardly we find the archetypes exposed in separate initiation and outwardly we find the interplay of mutual initiation that is the tantra of mundane life. All of that is part of the presentational system of Being. When we strip away that presentational system where self and other intertwine we find that they are interpenetrating already in the always already lost origin of the sexes and their mutual engendering. The whole of the presentational system of Being always points to its own emptiness. We are aspects of that self-indication and self-grasping. We project the world out of our existence as already gendered, i.e. so that it has faces to itself, and that the faces are faces to each other.

Patriarchy and Matriarchy

Many feminists portray a utopia at the beginning of time which was ruled by women and in which everything was peaceful and harmonious. But these feminists fail to apply the work of other women on primate social behavior to our own past. If they did that they would get a very different picture. More likely what is thought of as matriarchal originary social organization was really dominance by the father instead of by the husband. If we look at our species with a critical eye we will see that

women were always dominated except for a few anomalous instances. When changed was who dominated the women. The matriarchal social regime was much like the situation seen in primate social relations where there is an alpha male who is territorial and who dominates the females within his territory. He is surrounded by the beta males who attempt to take the territory and the females away from him. Outside of the Harem and the Beta males there are a group of outcast gamma males and outcast females. At the other extreme from the Alpha male is the epsilon male who everyone loves to hate and is the pharamacon for the group. Notice that the males are divided into four and the females are divided into two groups. Thus women are split into those in the harem and those outside the harem. Women in the harem recent studies show hedge their bets by having illicit relations with other males. This is because a new alpha male will kill their children when they take the place of the old alpha male if they are unknown to him. Thus the split in women between appearance and conniving meta-essence is extremely old. Also the split into classes of the Indo-European variety has its roots in primate social structures. The alpha male is like Varuna, the king. The beta males are like Indra, the warrior. The gamma males are like the twins, the farmers who manage the fecundity of the earth. And the epsilon males are like Mirta, the priesthood. As we have seen the kinds of Being are the differences between these male social classes of Indo-European society. Women are split into two and Men are split into four. Our problem is to attempt to regain our primordial unity. We endlessly move between the nihilistic fragmentation of our gendering and the unity of our gendering.

The transition from Matriarchy (dominance by the father and centralization of fertility resources) and the Patriarchy (dominance by the Husband, i.e. the beta male and distribution of fertility resources) is a major transformation in the human condition that occurred about six thousand years ago. It occurred when beta males ran off with the daughters of the alpha male and the females of the harem and this became socially sanctioned. This marriage of one male and one female is a new departure from the old polygamous social structure. It actually frees the woman to an extent because it allows her eventual power when the mother in law dies.

Thus the first period in the woman's life is when she is a girl in her father's house. Then she is exchanged and becomes a wife in another household and changes her name leaving her family for good. The next transition is when the mother in law dies and she gets control of the household as the ranking female. These transitions correspond to the archetypal levels. As a girl she is merely an appearance that is exchanged. But when she is exchanged then she learns about transformation as she changes her name and he abode. But when she becomes the head of the foreign household itself then she establishes her whim in everything not already determined by the husband. In the harem there is no eventual power, all power comes from the subtle gradations of status between the women in the harem. Thus patriarchy is a tremendous step forward for women who escape their fathers for life with their husbands. It is this that makes them lose their essence and substitutes for them their meta-essence as central. The men in their power relations develop essence, i.e. their differentiation into classes. Women on the other hand split into appearance and meta-essence. They are both be pawns in the clutches of the men and the ones that run circles around the men who do not understand transformation from one class to another as the women do, who enter the class of their husbands. When the essence of the man breaks up he goes berzerk and enters wild Being. It is though initiation that he learns to control this tendency to disintegrate into chaos. The wise old man is the one who understands transformation, as we see with the old man of the sea that Menalaus holds as he transforms. The wise woman is the one who understands the wilderness beyond the meta-essence of the woman.

So we can see that the transition between rule by the Father to rule by the husband held a fundamental advantage for women in terms of power relations among women. We also see that it is this transformation that sets up the relations between the kinds of Being that differ at various archetypal levels between men and women. Women were split in the Rule of the Father. They were also faceless. The main attribute of the Neolithic dolls that women often point to as signs of the worship of the female in hunter gatherer societies is the fact that all the dolls are faceless. This facelessness comes from the immersion in the harem that was probably kept

in caves. Ten percent of women produce sonar like sounds from their ears while only one percent of men do that. This indicates a lot of time spent by some women in caves or other dark places. We imagine that the harems of the alpha males were kept in caves. They were faceless sources of fecundity. Individual females did not matter. What mattered was who controlled the territory in which the women lived.

When rule by the husband began though the raiding of the Harem by the beta males who kidnapped wives, suddenly the faces of the women become significant. Thus we see the lifting of the veil in marriage as an extremely significant event. The women actually become faces of the world which the men face and see themselves reflected in terms of the response to their dominance behavior. Women become important as individuals with certain specific characteristics in this social transformation. At that moment the world faces itself and gazes into the face of the other.

We can see this in the story of Adam and Eve. Adam and Eve are not the first man and woman ever, but the first patriarchal man and woman. Adam by himself is the Alpha male. The women are lost inside him as an attribute of his territory. They are seen in outline within his body just as a rib is seen under the skin. When Eve is taken out of Adam by God then they suddenly face each other and look into each other's eyes. The rib is something that if straightened is broken. This lack of rightness in the woman is significant as it points to her lack of essence. The rib is something that is hollow, i.e. puts up an appearance but is ultimately empty. God tells the couple to avoid the tree of knowledge of good and evil. But there is the serpent in the garden that convinces them that if they eat of it then they will obtain immortality. So they eat of it. In the Quranic version Adam takes full responsibility for that. God sends them from the garden saying that they will be enemies and that men will toil and women will suffer in child-birth. Work is the process by which the essence of man is forged. Child-birth is an essential transformation for women like that of changing their name. Their expulsion from the garden is their marriage. At that point their marriage becomes something inward shared in private between the couple. Their children live

in this new inward garden that exists as a field between them. When their children are married they experience their own expulsion from the garden. Thus the expulsion from the garden has been repeated from the time of the first patriarchal man and his recognition of his wife till today. When they realized the nature of good and evil they recognized their nakedness in relation to each other. Thus they tried to cover themselves when God appeared to them in the Garden. In the Quran mutual covering is cited as the nature of the relations between man and wife. This mutual covering indicates that each archetypal level complements that of the mate.

There are four transformations in this story. The creation of Adam, the teaching of the names, creation of Eve and the expulsion from the garden. Now prior to the creation of Adam there is the production of all the good things of the world. Thus the world stands as a wilderness prior to the creation of Adam. When Adam is created we then God teaches him the names. Prior to that what exists is nameless. Thus language appears which has the nature of Hyper Being. Adam knows the name of everything except himself. At the moment that he tries to name himself God produces a mirror for him to see himself which is Eve. Adam looks into that mirror the way that Oedipus looks at the enigmatic sphinx. In that mirror Adam sees himself and thus attains knowledge of Good and Evil due to its mirroring back at him his actions as a face of the world. This mirroring is the process that Adam and Eve engage in together. But that process causes them to be expelled from the garden into the world of suffering. That world is where Pure Being exists as the production of nihilistic opposites in which we are caught and alienated. In the world Adam does work, i.e. becomes an essence while his wife Eve bears children in suffering. The conflict between the genders is the result of the production of nihilistic opposition between them.

While Adam represents essence and Eve represents meta-essence we have the Serpent to represent Wild Being and the Angel that is stationed at the door to the garden with the fiery sword to represent Pure Being. Adam encounters first the serpent, i.e. Wild Being and then the expulsion of Hyper Being before looking back to see the Angel of Pure Being.

Eve is first an appearance to Adam but after they gain knowledge of good and evil then they realize their nakedness and their consciousness is transformed thereby. The consciousness of meta-essence in the woman shows her the difference between naked appearance and cultural appearance in clothing. At the heart of that transformation is the Serpent that represents the Wild Being. There is no accident that the Medusa's head is covered with snakes. Expulsion means coming to terms with the process of bearing children for a man within the patriarchal system as Ariadne did for Dionysus. Looking back to see the Angel at the door of the garden is like the epiphany of Artemis to Ariadne. While for Adam it was like the appearance of Apollo to Achilles.

Athena and Dionysus are nihilistic opposites. They stand opposite Apollo and Artemis. The fact that Ariadne meets Dionysus and is killed by Artemis stands opposite the fact that Achilles is helped by Athena along with the other Acheeans and killed by Apollo. These nihilistic complementarities define the landscape of male and female initiation. The helper of the man is Athena and his nemesis is Apollo. The helper of the woman is Dionysus and her nemesis is Artemis. Thus the woman is helped by her inner wild self against the male like Animus. The man confronts his necessity for self knowledge that Apollo represents with the Anima that leads him into conflict where he becomes berzerk until Apollo stops that when it reaches beyond all limits. Help goes from Cathonic Female to Animus for the Woman while Help goes from Anima toward the Wise Old Man for the Male. Thus the direction of help is opposite in the man and the woman. Thus Artemis says to the woman that she should remain virgin and seek oneness with the earth and nature. But Dionysus helps her by allowing desire to reign and taboos to be broken celebrating sexuality and engendering. Between these two the woman is caught, between purity and impurity as Ariadne was when she betrayed her city due to her love of Theseus. Thus Athena says to the man that he should fight for his city and protect it and she leads him to do that. But Apollo says that he should know himself and do nothing to excess. So man is caught between his loyalty to his city and his need to be true to himself, as Achilles was.

Ontomythology

The study of the ontological implications of myths is called ontomythology. This kind of study was first introduced by the author in the work The Fragmentation of Being and the Path Beyond the Void. Here we see that this kind of interpretation leads us to a radical understanding of gender in ontological terms that sheds light on the archetypal structures within the self. In that study we recognize the necessity for initiation of the sexes separately so that these archetypal structures can be activated. Since men and women are inwardly different they need to be initiated separately. But after that they initiate each other though the mutual complementarity of their archetypal structures that are rooted differently in the kindness of Being. That mutual initiation is called tantra. Tantra is the recognition of the mutual complementarity of men and women in all their aspects. It is not just spiritual sexual practices. Ultimate Tantra is marriage. In our longer manuscript we have explored the meaning of Western Marriage as a non-nihilistic distinction. The whole of the kindness of Being as it plays upon the archetypes is about the establishment of this non-nihilistic distinction. As such it reaches out beyond Being into the emptiness which is non-dual and supra-rational. When we move beyond the complementarity of gendering in the Indo-European tradition we recognize interpenetration of all things by its mirroring in the interpenetration of man and woman. Ontomythology leads to this realization due to the fact that so much myth is centered on the relations between male and female. The male as we discovered in our longer study is represented by the positive fourfold while the woman is represented by the negative fourfold. These two fourfolds intertwine like to ogdad that gives rise to the atun (atom), i.e. the manifest emergent whole on the primordial background.